

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 10-11, 20-21, and 30 have been amended. Claims 9, 19, and 29 have been cancelled without prejudice. No new claims have been added.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejections

Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 5, 7-9, 11-13, 15, 17-19, 21-23, 25 and 27-29 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,334,124 (hereinafter "Bouchard"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Specifically, claim 1 as amended includes the limitation, or a limitation similar thereto, of:

configuring search indices on a server, the search indices being associated with corresponding business components;

displaying the search indices to a user of a client, the client being connected to the server via a computer network and being configured to perform search using data records stored on the client;

providing the user of the client with a mechanism to individually select one or more search indices for download onto the client; and

downloading the one or more selected search indices from the server onto the client, the one or more selected search indices to be used for searching on the client, wherein search index related information including index identifier and search engine identifier is stored in a first table and search index related file attachments are stored in a second table. (Applicants' Independent Claim 1).

Bouchard fails to disclose search index related information including index identifier and search engine identifier is stored in a first table and search index related file attachments are stored in a second table. However, the Examiner argued in the final Office Action that Bouchard discloses the above limitations by the cooperation between

server and client computers to maintain and update client indices at the client computers (Office Action, p. 4, third paragraph; citing Bouchard, col. 6, lines 56-64). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner. According to Bouchard, it merely discloses:

To facilitate local index searching, the client computers and the server computer work cooperatively to establish and/or maintain the client indices. This is because the server computer needs to stay involved to supply the client computers with the indices, to update the indices at the client computers as time goes by, or the like. This level of cooperation requires a multiplicity of commands to be transmitted between the client computers and the server computer. (Bouchard, col. 6, lines 56-64).

Bouchard does not disclose, suggest, or imply by the above disclosure search index related information, which includes index identifier, search engine identifier, and search index related file attachments. Furthermore, Bouchard does not disclose, suggest, or imply the specific manner the search index related information and search index related file attachments are stored. In contrast, claim 1 as amended sets forth that the search index related information is stored in a first table and the search index related file attachments are stored in a second table. Therefore, Bouchard fails to anticipate claim 1 as amended. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, Bouchard fails to anticipate claims 11 and 21 as amended. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejections.

Claims 2-3, 5, 7-8, 12-13, 15, 17-18, 22-23, 25, and 27-28 depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 11, and 21, respectively. Therefore, claims 2-3, 5, 7-8, 12-13, 15, 17-18, 22-23, 25, and 27-28 are not anticipated by Bouchard for at least the reasons

discussed above with respect to claims 1, 11, and 21. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Examiner rejected claims 6, 10, 16, 20, 26, and 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 6,334,124 (hereinafter “Bouchard”) as applied to claims 1-3, 5, 7-9, 11-13, 15, 17-19, 21-23, 25 and 27-29 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,546,385 (hereinafter “Mao”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1 and the following reason.

Mao is directed to a method and an apparatus for indexing and searching hardcopy documents, such as a book (Mao, col. 1, lines 9-14; col. 2, lines 28-31). In contrast, the present invention as claimed is related to searches using data records stored on a client and the search indices are associated with corresponding business components. The Examiner argued that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine Bouchard and Mao because “the client computer could be hand-held system for more feasible to perform more exhaustive searching of hardcopy documents” (Office Action, p. 5, paragraph 7). However, the present invention is not related to indexing and searching hardcopy documents. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art facing the problem the Applicants faced with would not have been motivated to look into Mao for a solution. It is impermissible to pick and choose among isolated disclosures in the prior art, through hindsight reconstruction, to show obviousness of the claimed invention. *In re Fritch*, 972 F.2d 1260, 1266 (1992). For at least this reason, claims 6, 10, 16, 20, 26, and 30 are patentable over Bouchard in view of Mao. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejections.

Note that it is unnecessary for Applicants to discuss the specific deficiencies in  
Appl. No. 09/883,776  
Amdt. Dated 8/23/2004  
Response to Final Office Action mailed June 21, 2004

each of Bouchard and Mao with respect to claims 6, 10, 16, 20, 26, and 30 because one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to combine Bouchard with Mao. However, Applicants reserve the right to argue on the specific deficiencies in each of Bouchard and Mao in the future.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call C. Teresa Wong at (408) 720-8300.

Authorization is hereby given to charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any charges that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN

Date: August 23, 2004

  
Chui-kiu Teresa Wong  
Reg. No. 48,042

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(408) 720-8300